

INTELLIGENCE DIGEST

A REVIEW OF WORLD AFFAIRS

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

Page

A New Phase in World Affairs	1
The Kremlin and the Middle East	4
Aden: Where To from Now?	6
Britain and Europe	9
a Foothold in Somalia	11
gedy	12
arsal for a Vietnam?	15
in America's Showplace	17
id-Up	19

privately from Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, England

THE ATTACK ON AMERICA

WE ARE POSITIVE that a large section of really responsible American opinion still does not realise exactly what is being planned to destroy the United States. It is imperative that the facts should be made known.

The basic plan is not—repeat not—to attack the U.S. with nuclear weapons. To do that would invite a retaliation which would extinguish Russia and, indeed, a large part of the world.

No; there is a far easier way. All that is necessary is to weaken and divide American domestic opinion and to create a vast revolutionary force inside America by employing 20 million Negroes—most of them completely unconscious of what it is all about. To achieve this a great network of front organisations has been created.

But it is essential to instil in the Negro population a sense of invincibility. To that end the black African states must be shown to dominate the United Nations and the entire Rhodesian and South African white bloc must be destroyed—must be shown to be powerless and helpless—and be rendered prostrate.

American opinion is invited to assist in this act of destruction.

Added to that, a vast propaganda

in Europe is built up to denigrate and eliminate American influence—all based on the apparently attractive theory of an independent European renaissance.

Together with *Intelligence Digest*, *The Weekly Review* is publishing many vital facts about these matters. It is essential that every American with a sense of history and who feels that American civilisation must be preserved should read these reports and make them more widely known.

In August, 1963, and September, 1964, *Intelligence Digest* published a full account of the subversion of Negro movements in the United States. This has now been brought up to date by the same observer who contributed the original reports. This up-to-date account of one of the greatest menaces which has ever confronted the United States will be published in three instalments in *The Weekly Review*, beginning with the issue of August 4, 1967.

If you do not yet subscribe to *The Weekly Review*, do so now in order not to miss this essential and important story. This knowledge is vital to everyone with the future of America at heart.

All you have to do is to complete the form below and send it to us by air mail.

To: THE WEEKLY REVIEW,
41 Rodney Road,
Cheltenham,
Gloucestershire,
England

ID S/WR.1.

Please enter me as a subscriber to THE WEEKLY REVIEW (52 issues) by air mail at the reduced rate of only \$28.00. (Normally \$36.00.)

Please bill me/I enclose my cheque. (Delete as necessary.)
(If you pay cash with order, you save us book-keeping costs so deduct \$2.00.)

Name (Block letters)

Address

Date..... Signature.....

INTELLIGENCE DIGEST

A REVIEW OF WORLD AFFAIRS

A NEW PHASE IN WORLD AFFAIRS

WITH ISRAEL'S military victory over Syria, Jordan, and Egypt, we have entered a new phase in world affairs. As this Service has, over the years, constantly informed its readers, the fulcrum of Russia's plans to reach her objective of world domination is the Middle East. That is the key area in Russia's strategic concept.

Without control of the Middle East Russia cannot get very far—although she can be a perpetual thorn in the flesh in many other ways. But control of the Middle East would give her a dominating strategic position in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean as well as virtual economic control of Europe through Middle East oil. Also it is the only prize available to Russia big enough to off-set the growing power of China.

True, Russia could use other methods, such as a massive surprise nuclear attack on the United States, for which she now has the capacity. The Russian leaders, however, are materialists, and they do not want control of a world in ruins. What they want is domination of a world in working order. Moreover, America's retaliatory power has to be reckoned with; although in that respect the strategic balance is steadily tilting in Russia's favour.

Clear Evidence

The evidence of Russia's objective is clear. During the fifty years since the Bolshevik revolution, this objective has been stated and re-stated over and over again in the plainest terms. Only the tactics have varied from time to time. Yet the Free World has refused to believe

that the Russian leaders have meant, and still mean, what they say.

However, they want to win world domination without a general nuclear war. The massive Russian nuclear threat is intended as a weapon of blackmail. The Russians calculate that by the world-wide subversion of all western influences—in which they have already achieved a great deal—and by getting control of the Middle East, they can dictate to the Free World and that the Free World will have either to surrender or save (?) itself by being the first to fire its offensive nuclear weapons—and they do not believe that the United States (which controls the western nuclear armoury) will do this.

The Most Important Factor of All

There is one further aspect of Russia's Middle East policy which is never mentioned. Perhaps it is not realised, although it may ultimately prove to be the most important of all.

Behind all Moscow's strategy and diplomacy, and despite all its belief that the western Powers will let Russia get away with all she seeks, there lurks the fear that one day the Anglo-Saxon Powers may suddenly react and say—"No further".

With that possibility in the background—however remote the Russians may think it to be—they are preparing the Middle East as the great battleground on which the final confrontation between East and West, between the Free World and the Communist world, can take

place without damage to the Russian homeland.

That is our factual information from sources available to this Service in Moscow and elsewhere. Over the long term (and perhaps not so long), this is the most important factor in the whole situation.

Co-existence

Meanwhile, we continue to talk of co-existence. So do the Russians. They are always talking about it. The Russian interpretation of "co-existence", however, is freedom to carry on the cold war against the West without opposition and to have complete freedom to infiltrate and subvert wherever they wish.

We see this happening all over the world—in Asia, Africa, Latin America—under the guise of help for the under-developed countries. This is not the benevolent exercise it is portrayed as being. The Russians care nothing for the welfare of the under-developed, and there is not a scrap of evidence to suggest that they do. Nor is it an ideological urge to bestow the blessings of Communism. In fact, the Kremlin leaders care little, if anything, for Communism as an ideology. It is merely a weapon to be used in aid of their totalitarian ambitions.

Middle East Plans Go Wrong

In the Middle East, the Russians had expected and planned to acquire by proxy a degree of control amounting to suzerainty. This, thanks to the tiny State of Israel, has failed. This is a fact. It has nothing whatsoever to do with pro- or anti-semitism. It has nothing whatsoever to do with whether the creation of the State of Israel was or was not justified. In this context, those matters are irrelevancies.

What matters is that Egypt and Syria, and to some extent Iraq, and Jordan (unwillingly), were the tools of Russian Middle Eastern ambitions. They have been smitten out of Russia's hand by Israel and, for the time being, Russian plans have had a bad set-back.

Russia, therefore, must now choose between abdication and direct control.

She cannot abdicate from the Middle East without also abandoning her major projects elsewhere as well as her major world objective—or at any rate without pursuing them by much more violent and perilous means which might involve the decimation of a large part of Russia.

Russia must therefore come much more into the open and assume direct control over her Arab satellites and be prepared, if necessary, for direct military intervention in due course—although there may be a waiting phase.

Reports that Russia has already realised this and is acting accordingly come to us from every source of information available to this Service.

What to Expect Now

This is an entirely new phase in the Middle East situation (although it has long been foreseen and forecast by this Service, as many subscribers of long standing know) and it will necessarily be reflected in Soviet policy elsewhere.

Not by any means the least important result of this will be that many of the "uncommitted" nations will be forced to take one side or the other. So will countries which, while not officially "uncommitted", have sometimes pursued somewhat equivocal and ambivalent policies—West Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey, for example.¹ It is going to become increasingly difficult for any country to be uncommitted.

We can now expect:

1. A Mediterranean rather than purely Middle Eastern strategy on Russia's part. Russian naval movements have already indicated this.

2. Direct and strict control by Russia of the Arab satellites.

3. An eventual renewal of hostilities in the Middle East, with the possibility of direct Russian military intervention—although this will be a last resort to which Russia may be driven against her will.

4. Renewed and determined

¹It is only fair, however, to say that much of this has been caused by indeterminateness on the part of Britain and America. But that does not alter the fact.

attempts to neutralise Germany and Turkey.

5. Efforts to bring Persia (and if possible Turkey) within the Russian sphere of influence. Both Turkey and Persia should be closely observed.

6. Renewed attempts to isolate South Africa and Rhodesia.

7. Renewed attempts to isolate America from Europe.

8. A still further stepping-up of racial strife in America.

Perilously Close

We are now perilously close to the situation envisaged by this Service for some time—a Russian military force in the Middle East. The next step, for which preparations have already been made, will be the establishment of a Russian physical presence in the Horn of Africa (in which Ethiopia as well as Somalia may play a part). In a very short time, therefore, Russia may well be present in force in the east Mediterranean, and dominate the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf.

This, of course, makes it completely crazy to quarrel with South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese territories. It is now, more than ever before, a strategic essential of high priority to strengthen and encourage the concept of a strong, viable southern African community of nations consisting of Angola, Mozambique, Malawi, Rhodesia, South-West Africa, Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland, and South Africa.

This is the South African concept initiated by the far-seeing Dr. Verwoerd and pursued by Mr. Vorster and his colleagues. It should have a very high place in strategic and political planning in both London and Washington.

Strategic Strongholds

If the western Powers were to make it abundantly clear that a Russian military presence in the Middle East will not be tolerated, the threat might be averted—or at any rate postponed. As it is, we are leaving Russia with the initiative. Apart from that, the Free World's strategic strongholds are now the United States, western Europe (very vulnerable

both militarily and politically), southern Africa, the Australasian area, and Japan and the east Asian islands (also very vulnerable politically).

The Free World, and particularly Britain and the United States, should not readily or willingly allow anything—repeat anything—to interfere with or prejudice the security and well-being of those areas.

The Atlantic Alliance

Although the Indian Ocean and a large part of the Pacific are involved in a strategic concept of this kind, a reaffirmation and reinvigoration of the Atlantic alliance must be its backbone.

Amongst other things, careful thought should be given to whether this is a good moment for Britain to enter the European Economic Community—with all its political implications—if this involves a further loosening of the Atlantic alliance.

It is often argued that British membership of the Common Market would bring western Europe and America closer to each other, with Britain as a bridge. But the present members (except Holland)—as reports recently published by this Service from our very well informed Rome Correspondent have shown—categorically refuse to entertain any such idea. Indeed, it is clear that a condition for British entry is that she must abandon, once and for all, not only the Commonwealth concept but also any kind of special relationship with the United States.

The whole question of Britain and the Common Market should now be re-examined in the context of the new phase in world strategic affairs.

Much Re-thinking Needed

Indeed, much re-thinking is now called for. Atlantic unity to bring about a common Atlantic policy cannot be achieved without the sacrifice of many dearly-held prejudices on both sides of the Atlantic. It may be that a concept will emerge—dictated by hard facts—that some sacrifice of political sovereignty is necessary *as between nations enjoying a common standard of political and*

social morality (the emphasis is essential to any such concept).

Such a suggestion goes a long way beyond most contemporary thought. But it is something to which very serious consideration should be given in the present perilous situation of the Free World.

One thing is certain. There is a growing sense of isolationism as between western Europe, the United States and Canada, and Britain. It is essential that this be put into reverse. It is doubtful if there are any other human agencies through which the Free World can save itself.

Peace and Security Have a Price

The Editor of this Service is well aware that this is a highly controversial suggestion to throw out, and may well infuriate American, French, and British Conservatives. Paradoxically, it is the Conservatives of the Free World—anti-Communist though they are—who nurture long-dead political controversies to the point of enmity. In Britain there is, of course, the old Suez group which still remembers with some bitterness Washington's historic mistake in 1956.

But what happened in 1956—when Washington's policy was 100 per cent wrong, as events have shown—should not prejudice one as to the facts and needs of the present situation.

Peace and security have a price. If that price involves political sacrifices and the abandonment of strong (and mostly genuinely-conceived) prejudices then that cost should be weighed against that of nuclear war.

God is not Dead

There is one further consideration—and it is the paramount fact in world affairs. We have condemned ourselves to the use of material means for our security, and we must therefore use them to the best of our ability. This is the price of apostasy, and we have to pay it, as the prophets of old warned us we would.

But these material means will eventually fail us unless we accept that, ultimately, only God can settle world affairs. The materialistic concept that, by his own unaided efforts, man can establish lasting peace is directly contrary to Christian teaching.

God is not dead.

THE KREMLIN AND THE MIDDLE EAST

NEWSPAPERS on both sides of the Atlantic awoke rather belatedly in the third week of July to the realisation that there are differences in the Kremlin over the Middle East—a state of affairs to which this Service drew attention in *The Weekly Review* of June 30.

Nasser having suffered a shattering defeat, Israel having destroyed or captured much of Russia's mighty multi-million-pounds worth arsenal of weapons, and, on top of all this, the grand propaganda offensive at the United Nations, led personally by Premier Kosygin, having collapsed, the men in the Kremlin have good reason to be anxious and bewildered. This is understandable and as could have been expected.

On the other hand, the timidity of the western Powers—particularly the United States and Britain—in face of all the bluster and threats and attempts at

intimidation by Moscow and its Arab friends could turn out to be yet another exercise in diplomatic reserve which may be misinterpreted by Russia—with regrettable consequences.

The Soviet Mediterranean Fleet

An example to the point is the strange absence of any vigorous reaction in either Washington or London to the arrival of a large fleet of Soviet warships in the east Mediterranean—a squadron in fact, which has now grown to 14 units with naval landing troops aboard some of them.

Not only is this powerful force reportedly settling down for an indefinite stay in Alexandria and Port Said, but Admiral Moloshov, the man in command, is boastfully proclaimed all over the place to have volunteered the declaration that he is ready to fight at

the side of Russia's Arab friends.

It is not difficult to imagine the screams of rage from Moscow, accompanied by charges of aggression, provocation, etc., if even a solitary American or British gunboat ventured to enter the Gulf of Aqaba or went to Haifa or Jaffa on a friendly visit to Israel.

Israel's Service to the West

As a matter of fact, some such gesture to Israel would not be inappropriate. Israel did, after all, not do a disservice to the so-called capitalist world by winning the six-day war against overwhelming odds. And if the western Powers are thinking about oil, it is as well to realise that Middle East oil will not start to flow anew because of the Arabs' appreciation of western disapproval of Israel's obvious wish to make the best of her success.

The pipelines will not be turned on again until the Arab oil-producing countries are shocked out of their present hysteria by hard economic facts.

If Nasser Had Won

One must be realistic about what has happened. As the Israeli Brigadier Hertzog put it the other day, if Nasser had won Russia would have been installed as supreme master of the whole Middle East, with her tentacles spread over the African continent and in a position to defy both the United States and China. This is a realistic picture of what might have happened.

The Israeli English-language newspaper, the *Jerusalem Post*, reprinted a few days ago an article by Mr. Tishon, Israel's foremost writer and satirist. This had originally appeared in the same newspaper in December, 1956, shortly after the Sinai campaign. In it, he visualised the aftermath of that war, had Nasser won. It rings true today just as much as it did in 1956.

An Apocalyptic Vision

Tishon gives a graphic description of Tel Aviv and Haifa laid flat by bombing raids, the survivors sheltering in camps under the protection of the

United Nations, of Nasser holding a victory parade surrounded by Soviet officers, and of the world's sympathy for Israel's defeat and ruin. The article gives a bitterly vivid account of the endless debate at the United Nations over who was the aggressor, naturally without any agreement being reached on that or any other vital issue.

However, world opinion was unanimous on one point, wrote Tishon in his apocalyptic vision. Israel, it was being said everywhere, was herself to blame for her misfortune, as she had not taken adequate measures in time to foil the Arab attack!

A Surprise Blow?

Is it likely that the Kremlin may be contemplating, and indeed preparing, a surprise blow against Israel? To contemplate such a move as a possibility is one thing. Actually to execute it is something quite different, say our observers.

True, much planning is taking place. Russian military "advisers" are arriving in numbers in the United Arab Republic. The Egyptian Chief of Staff and a large body of senior Arab officers are known to have been in Moscow during July for briefing by the Soviet Defence Minister and his General Staff, and there is no sign of a drying up of the flow of military supplies to Egypt by sea and air. There is nothing peaceable about all this.

Wait and See

All the same, in the opinion of our observers on the spot, the indications are that for the time being the Arabs have to play a wait-and-see, take-your-chance game on a limited scale while continuing to fan a war psychosis. This is the line with which the recent small summit meeting of Socialist Arab leaders is understood to have had to be content.

The pompous assertion about having decided on steps to liquidate the Israeli occupation has no immediate substance behind it. For one thing, only five of the thirteen Arab League countries took part and they were in no

position to take decisions binding on all. The rule is that such decisions must be unanimous or that any member who disagrees need not abide by the resolution.

Russians Biding Their Time

Colonel Boumédiène and General Aref were sent to Moscow to insist on more concrete assurances and directives and to ask for more substantial immediate economic aid.

The Russians, however, are apparently biding their time and contend that political and propaganda means are far from being exhausted. They say that the longer the Israelis are exposed to pressures of all kinds—especially the burden of coping with the military, financial, and administrative problems arising from their new position—the better the chances for Russia and the Arabs will become in every sense.

The western attitude, too, is ex-

pected to veer as time goes on; and our observers agree that there is a danger that the Russians might be encouraged by the inertness of the West.

Russia's Gains

Despite the loss of a vast armoury and the general set-back, Russia is not without gains from the recent war. She now has complete control over the defeated Arabs. Egypt and Syria in particular are now completely dependent on Russia. They dare not with impunity lift a finger without Russian permission.

As for Israel, she is a lonely country. She has done a great service to the Free World and is the West's only reliable friend in the Middle East. That is a fact, whether one wishes it were so or not.

Yet she is cold-shouldered by the western Powers—except by western public opinion, which may yet have its impact on governments.

ADEN: WHERE TO FROM NOW?

OUR SPECIAL Correspondent in the Middle East reports:

When the British defence review announced last year the complete withdrawal of troops from the South Arabian Federation, it also stated that Britain would be able to fulfil her remaining obligations in the Middle East by making a small increase in British forces stationed in the Persian Gulf. But can she fulfil these obligations (presuming she does not renounce present defence treaties with other Arabian states) if the balance of power is altered in the peninsula?

There is at present stationed in Republican Yemen a force of Egyptian troops representing a government totally opposed to the form of rule of every other state on the Arabian peninsula, and the rejection of Mr. George Brown's plea to Nasser to stop the terrorism in Aden does not bode well for the future peace of the Federation.

With the withdrawal of British troops from Aden later this year or early next year, unless the South Arabian Federation is given sufficient military aid, Egyptian forces could be in

Aden in a few days at the most after the last British soldier pulls out.

Apart from the quantities of supplies and equipment left by evacuation, the port installations, and the prize of Aden itself, Nasser would then have control of both ends of the Red Sea and a second base from which to launch his attacks against the Royalists in the Yemen and any dissident Shaikhs in the South Arabian Federation.

If this is allowed to happen, then within a short time both Saudi Arabia and the British bases in the Gulf could be involved directly or indirectly in a full-scale war in the area.

Federal Armed Forces

At present, the troops of the Federation (the Federal Regular Army) consist of 3,000 men, who have to defend an area of 60,000 square miles. It is hoped to expand the present five battalions to ten and to supplement them with an air force of a few jet Provosts. The Government has also requested some Hunters, but whether these will be forthcoming is still in doubt.

These armed forces will, it is hoped, be able to defend the Federation and Aden (already well infiltrated) against the joint forces of the Yemen Republic, the Front for the Liberation of South Yemen, and the Egyptian Army.

Though the Shaikhs of the Federation may decide to fight, some would certainly be in no position to put up much resistance. At the same time, the Federation has few coastal defence forces or navy. A seaborne invasion could easily be launched similar to the one by the Egyptians at Hodeidah at the outbreak of the war in the Yemen. Thus, unless the Federal Army abandoned the rest of the Federation, it could not defend Aden.

Saudi Arabian Help?

It has been suggested that Saudi Arabian forces could help to protect the Federation. Egypt has already threatened to occupy the Saudi towns on the Yemen frontier and King Faisal has moved a large proportion of his troops and surface-to-air missiles to the area between Jizzan and Najran. He would probably be unable to spare any troops for garrison duties in the Federation, and if it were attacked would be unlikely to get his Air Force to make any strikes there. It is nearly 1,000 miles from the Saudi Air Force bases at Riyadh and Jedda to Aden, and this means flying directly over Egyptian-held territory.

The only practical help the Saudis could give would be to bomb lines of communication in the Yemen. They would then be brought directly into conflict with Egypt.

Therefore it seems certain that if the Federation is attacked it will collapse unless outside aid is forthcoming. The Saudi Government is not in a position to give it, and the only other major Power on the peninsula is Great Britain.

Republican Yemen's Subversion

The population of Aden is around 138,000, of whom 48,000 are Republican Yemenis. The Yemenis constitute the second largest ethnic group in Aden, though a large proportion of them are continually moving backwards and for-

wards to Republican Yemen. It is a section of this group which has been most voluble in demanding the restoration of Aden to that country.

Although for many years the Yemen has considered the area of the Federation as "occupied South Yemen", it was not until the Egyptian invasion that concerted acts of sabotage and continual political disruption began. If Aden were to be occupied by the Egyptians or the Republicans, it would open up a base from which to launch a second front against the Royalists of the Yemen. This is especially important to the Egyptian forces, as the roads to Taiz are lightly held and the road between Hodeidah, the main Yemeni port, and the capital, is kept open only with difficulty against constant Royalist action.

The Value of Aden

Aden also has excellent harbour installations and civil and military air fields. It dominates all the trade routes between the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea. The propaganda value of seizing Aden would be great, but the economic value would be beyond calculation.

If Aden and the Federation are attacked, Britain (having no longer any defence commitments there) may decide to do nothing. Yet, by the presence of a hostile force in the Federation, the Trucial States and Muscat will be threatened.

The Omani Liberation Front is known to have the backing of Cairo, and a rising similar to that of 1958 would not be surprising and would probably be more successful if Egyptian MiG fighters were to join the conflict and large supplies of arms were smuggled in from the coast.

The Muscat coast, with its new oil installations, would provide an easy target for increased subversion and possibly armed incursions from the Omani mountains.

The very loose federation of the Trucial Oman States is also ripe for Egyptian infiltration, and old rivalries between rulers could easily be revived. In a short time the substantial oil supplies in Abu Dhabi and Qatar could be controlled by Egypt.

British troops in Bahrain would be hard put to it to control outbreaks of violence in all of these areas, and Bahrain itself would not be a firm base if the islands were subverted by Egyptian and Iraqi influences and if old religious differences turned into outright civil war and the Cairo-controlled trade union organisation decided to bring the island's economy to a standstill and severely hamper the operations of the airport.

Bahrain has the potential to become just as much a hostile base as Aden.

If the Egyptians were to have any success in the southern part of the Gulf, renewed pressure on Kuwait would be likely from Iraq, which continues greedily to eye the vast Kuwait oil revenues. If Iraq can pacify the warlike Kurds in the north, its attention will soon be turned southwards again.

Alternative Choices

How, then, can Britain stop the rot? She can, of course, opt completely out of any action in the area and withdraw from all alliances and bases. This would seem impracticable if peace is to be kept. On the other hand, she could help to set up some sort of mutual defence treaty within the Middle East area. This is what King Faisal has been trying to do with his Islamic Pact.

Britain tried this before in the early 1950s, but without much success. An anti-Nasser mutual defence treaty backed by Britain and consisting of Jordan, the Federation, the Gulf States, Iran, and Saudi Arabia would immediately run into problems for Britain. Without the weapons, equipment, and economic resources of both Jordan and Saudi Arabia, this sort of pact would not survive.

Moreover, there is always the very real danger that Britain might find herself by treaty bound to support an Arab country attacked by Israel (instead of Egypt), or seeing British equipment supplied specifically for a defence agreement being used against Israel. Thus, any attempt to set up a British-backed Middle East defence treaty is fraught with difficulties.

The Flash-Point

In the event of war in South Arabia, Britain would be the only Power capable of containing it, either under the auspices of the United Nations or alone. The flash-point is Aden, and therefore the best place to keep the resources for controlling the situation is there.

A defence agreement for a period, say, of five years could be signed which would give the R.A.F. rights to garrison Kormarrar air base for use as a staging-post for transport command and a joint base for both the Federation Air Force and a squadron of British fighters. This would retain a fully equipped airfield as a staging-post strategically placed to bring in most of East Africa and the Middle East and discourage air attacks from Republican Yemen.

Also, certain harbour facilities should be kept at Aden. Part of the dockyards could be isolated, such as Maalla wharf area, so that they become self-contained. A battalion of troops would be all that would be needed as garrison. It is the presence of troops of a third Power, not the number, that is the guarantee of peace in the area.

Why British Troops?

Why should these troops be British? Attempts have been made to bring in Saudi troops, but for various economic and political reasons this has been found to be impracticable. When Kuwait was threatened by Iraq, British troops which were called in were subsequently replaced by soldiers of the Arab League. But now, with the League split between supporters of Nasser and King Faisal, there are no neutral Arab troops to take over.

The United Nations might be able to do this duty, but with a potential anti-Federation lobby in the General Assembly difficulties would certainly arise, and by the time anything was got under way it would almost certainly be too late to stop war breaking out.

First, the United Nations would have trouble raising the troops and paying for them. Secondly, many countries are pro-Nasser and anti-"colonialist" and would therefore cause

considerable delay by debate in the General Assembly. Thirdly, by the time the United Nations had (providing it ever could) raised the troops and had the decision to move in ratified by the General Assembly, it would be too late. Therefore Britain might hang on. This, of course, is at her own expense.

Defence Agreement

So, the cheapest and fairest way out is a defence agreement with the Federation. This would give Britain air force and naval facilities at Kormarrah and Aden. Thus, the bases built at enormous expense would still be used. They are still of strategic value and their use would save considerable sums being spent elsewhere in the Gulf.

To quote the defence review again: "The visible presence of British forces by itself is a deterrent to local conflict and the Federation is no exception to this rule. Their presence in Aden would act as a deterrent to Nasser in the event of his planning an invasion from Republican Yemen."

With the Federation allowed to flourish and with Nasser contained and preferably forced to withdraw from the Yemen, the danger of a similar situation arising in Bahrain is removed.

Britain is going ahead with the

granting of independence to the South Arabian Federation. A British presence, however small, is a guarantee for peace in the area. Unless Britain wishes to see the whole of the Middle East aflame, with the resulting economic and political chaos, it must be willing to spend a little now to save a great deal in the future.

Freedom and Unity of the Arabian South

What is now at stake is the unity and freedom of South Arabia, and it is no longer a question between independence and imperialism. The main struggle of the Federal Government will be to preserve its unity against the subversive activities of the Cairo-sponsored and financed terrorist groups, and against Nasser's geo-political ambitions.

At this moment in Aden, we see the results of the British Government's declaration of withdrawal and abandonment of Britain's friends in South Arabia. No Arab country is safe from Nasser and, if he is not stopped, he will sweep aside, one by one, those countries which are opposed to his views, until the whole of the peninsula is under his sway.

It is the moral duty of Britain to prevent this by every means in her power.

BRITAIN AND EUROPE

THE FOLLOWING is based largely on reports from our Rome Correspondent, who has been making a special study of trends of political and strategic thought in western Europe in the context of Britain's application to enter the Common Market.

This is an extremely important subject, which, as suggested elsewhere in this issue of *Intelligence Digest*, must now be appraised afresh in a world-wide strategic context rather than merely in the light of Britain's immediate economic interests. The whole strategic and political alignment of the Free World will be affected by the decisions arrived at.

Something is changing in Europe. Every west European country feels a

sense of urgency in the finding of a way to guarantee greater security for Europe. Britain, it is believed, having lost her position of world power, now seeks a European outlet for her political genius. Some, but not all, members of the European Economic Community welcome this.

Europe's Chronic Weakness

The Middle East crisis adds urgency. At present, no European country is strong enough decisively to intervene; and, according to our Correspondent, there has been an unfortunate lack of responsible interest. Moreover, it appeared to Europeans that whereas the war was real enough for Israel and the Arabs, there was also a diplomatic war

conducted exclusively between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union.

Europe once again showed its chronic weakness. Europeans, however, feel systematically excluded from international problems, although it is sometimes thought useful to seek European advice on matters to which a wide political experience may make a contribution.

Overall, however, Europe feels that there is nothing to be done about whatever decisions may be reached between America and Russia. Even in the Mediterranean, the strongest naval Power is the United States; and now the Soviet Union claims that it is necessary to have a fleet there to safeguard Russian interests.

Western Europe is an astonished spectator who can do absolutely nothing to control events—so it is felt.

The Division of Europe

Many thoughtful Europeans find the cause of this situation in the division of Europe. While admitting that history cannot be reversed in a few years, they believe that if Britain were to join the EEC as soon as possible there would be an opportunity to create a strong western Europe capable of exerting its influence on international questions without any feeling of inferiority and no longer needing to be subject to the outcome of American-Soviet diplomacy.

Such Europeans put forward powerful economic arguments to tempt Britain into Europe, but their desire for Britain to join is really based on their wish to have the benefit of what our Correspondent describes as "the contribution of the greatest political experience in the world and of a higher development in the technological field".

Our Correspondent continues: "It can be said that Britain could assume, by full right, the leadership of this organisation, once in, and so give a certain political stability to Europe".

De Gaulle's Fears

That is what the west European Anglophiles say—and believe. However, the recent meeting of the Council of

Ministers of the EEC shows another side. Indeed, it suggests that President de Gaulle is very much afraid of losing his assumed leadership of western Europe as a consequence of British membership.

The French Foreign Minister, M. Couve de Murville, pointed out at the meeting that British agriculture would find itself in serious trouble if Britain accepted the Treaty of Rome as it stands. Some observers were somewhat astonished—to put it mildly—at this sudden French concern for the welfare of the British farmer.

Indeed, in every aspect, France is putting the strictest possible interpretations on the Treaty of Rome in order, in our Correspondent's opinion, to make things as difficult as possible for Britain.

Partnership with the U.S.A.

Even the Anglophiles, however, insist that the Europe they envisage, strengthened by Britain, must become a completely independent bloc capable of counter-balancing the two super-Powers. Out of this, they argue, a true European-American partnership will grow for the simple reason that it will be a logical development.

But, they say, in order to achieve this Britain must renounce the "special relationship" with America and must be prepared to be wholly European. They point out—rightly or wrongly—that the only alternative for Britain is eventually to become an American state.¹ They believe—again rightly or wrongly—that, little by little, Britain is becoming aware of this.² They also contend that much of Britain's economic weakness is due to her lack of a new function in the international political field.

These are European arguments and,

¹This is a rather intriguing thought. One wonders what those in the United States who support the steady growth of Federal authority as opposed to states' rights would have to say about it; and what London's views on states' rights would be.—*Ed.*

²It is quite true that some former right wing opponents of British entry into EEC have changed their attitude precisely for this reason.—*Ed.*

whether one agrees with them or not, they deserve the most careful and respectful consideration.

One thing, however, remains cer-

tain. Britain's final decision must be based on political and strategic factors rather than on purely economic considerations.

THE RUSSIAN FOOTHOLD IN SOMALIA

OUR SPECIAL Correspondent on African Affairs reports:

The election of a new President in Somalia, Dr. Abdirashid Ali Sharmarke, will not in any way affect the firm military foothold which Russia has in that country. In the speculation which has appeared in the West about President Sharmarke's possible political attitudes, one important fact is continually overlooked.

This is that Sharmarke is by no means a newcomer on the Somali political scene. Moreover, during the period 1962 to 1964, when the foundation was laid for the close association between Somalia and Russia and the agreements concluded for establishing the Soviet military presence there, Sharmarke was Somalia's Prime Minister.

It was he who broke off diplomatic relations with Britain in 1963 and who then threw his country's doors open to Russia. The fact that he did so reluctantly and only after a classic case of betrayal by Britain (over the issue of the Somali population of the Northern Frontier District of Kenya) may be pleaded as mitigating circumstances, but no more than that.

It is also as well to remember that Sharmarke is on terms of personal friendship with Nasser, although the closing of the Suez Canal has been a bitter blow to Somalia's economy.

Forgotten Promises

What is, however, to be expected is that Sharmarke will demand that Russia fulfils more than her mere military obligations towards his country. For Somalia, the unfortunate truth is that Russia has conveniently forgotten many of the promises made to Sharmarke during his period as Prime Minister.

For instance, there was to be an immediate loan of £14.5 million. Nearly

five years have passed since the loan was promised, but so far Somalia has received only £2.25 million.

Russia was also going to start a number of industrial projects to revolutionise Somalia's economy. Next to nothing has come of all that, and the little that has been done has been a failure. Three specific projects originally received wide publicity.

Projects that Failed

The first was the development of a fishing industry, with a fish processing factory at Las Khereh. It has taken the Russians four years to build the processing factory—only to discover that there is not enough fish off the Somali coast for processing purposes and that the waters in that part of the Red Sea are not suitable for any kind of fishing industry.

Second, a major dairy plant was built in Mogadishu. This was modelled on some dairy plant in Russia, but a fairly important factor was overlooked. This is that Somalia has no cattle worth mentioning and therefore no milk. The terrain is totally unsuitable for milk production on any scale.

And, third, an elaborate meat canning factory was built at Kismayo in complete disregard of the fact that Somalia has no meat for canning. There is a surplus of camels, but these earn more when exported alive to the Middle East than as meat.

Yet the Russians are demanding payment of interest on the capital spent on the construction of these projects. It is the kind of Soviet aid which Sharmarke is unlikely to tolerate, and it can be expected that he will demand an urgent review of Russia's aid programme.

China, incidentally, also promised various aid projects, but the only practical achievement has been a "national"

theatre in Mogadishu for the use of Chinese theatrical troupes.

A Big Army

The most tangible Soviet aid (other than military) has been the construction of a powerful radio station in Mogadishu and a fine printing press. Both are now pouring out Russian propaganda, which has to be paid for by the Somali Information Ministry.

However, on the military side Somalia has no grounds for complaint. An army of 20,000 men, well equipped with modern weapons and, as far as can be judged, well trained, is both the envy and the dread of Somalia's two neighbours, Ethiopia and Kenya. That this powerful army happens to be a stone's-throw from Aden and the South Arabian peninsula appear to have been, so far, overlooked by Britain. More may be heard of this Russian-trained and pro-Egyptian Army when Aden becomes independent next year.

A Major Air Base

There may, however, be some disagreement between Sharmarke and the Russians about the modern air force with which the Somalis are ostensibly being equipped. A large part of it is already

there—it will eventually have 150 modern MiG aircraft—but it is entirely under Russian control. For four years the Russians have been training Somali pilots and technicians, but so far the only pilots flying the aircraft are Soviet pilots stationed in Somalia.

What has, in fact, been happening is that the Russians are building a major air base for themselves for the exclusive use of the Red Air Force in what is strategically a vital area dominating East Africa, the Red Sea, and the South Arabian peninsula.

This is not what Sharmarke envisaged when, as Prime Minister, he concluded the original agreements with Moscow. He is almost certain to demand some change in this arrangement. But merely having some Somali pilots included in the "Somali" Air Force is not likely to alter the strategic picture much.

* * *

Editor's Note

Are London and Washington aware of all this? If they are, what, if anything, are they doing to exploit Somali disillusionment over Russian aid? Why not ask your Member of Parliament or Congressman?

AFRICAN TRAGEDY

DURING THE four years that the so-called United Nations peace-keeping force was bogged down in the Congo quagmire, trying to browbeat Katanga into submission and generally restoring "order" for an almost mythical Leopoldville (as Kinshasa was then called) Government, one of its very few redeeming features was the magnificent behaviour of the Nigerian contingent.

At first under its white and later under its own black officers, this contingent puts to absolute shame the mobs in uniform who had come from Ireland, Ethiopia, Sweden, and even India to serve as mercenaries of the worst kind under the flag of the United Nations. The debt which the Congo at that time owed to Nigeria was completely

overlooked in the shambles in which the U.N. left the former Belgian Africa.

In a sense, therefore, it is a measure of the general African tragedy that there should now simultaneously be civil war in both the Congo and Nigeria, that the passage of only two short years has dragged Nigeria down to the level of "another Congo", and that the Governments in Kinshasa and Lagos should find it necessary simultaneously to appeal for outside help to come to their assistance to crush revolts and to re-establish their authority.

The Basic Problem

There are, of course, differences in the respective situations in the Congo and Nigeria, but they are differences only of degree. The basic tragedy of both

countries is that their tribal compositions are such that the people simply will not give up the age-old custom of butchering one another. The "political" problems in each case are simply sophisticated developments of this basic problem.

That outside interests have, on the one hand, blatantly and ruthlessly exploited this fatal flaw, and, on the other hand, hopelessly failed to understand its nature, has considerably aggravated the problem, and has made it impossible for Africa to make any progress towards finding a solution of its own.

The outside interests referred to in this connection apply, in the first case, to the Communist bloc and, in the second, collectively to the West.

The Nigerians have at least the considerable merit that they basically realise the nature of their affliction and do not endlessly resort to allegations of foreign invasions or foreign-induced revolts, as is the custom in the Congo.

Katangese Revolt

The present civil war in the Congo (whether it is temporarily suppressed or not) is something very different from the Communist-inspired and Communist-led revolt of two years ago. It arises from the fact that the Katangese have found it impossible to live normally with the rest of the Congo and to suffer patiently under the misrule in Kinshasa.

As a result, the Katangese part of the Congo Army revolts from time to time, even when its members have been removed from Katanga and sent to other parts of the Congo. Their grievances are frequently aggravated by the fact that there is a habit of often not paying them and of sometimes forgetting that, like all soldiers, they like to have enough to eat.

The fact that there are among the Katangese still a number of mercenary troops originally recruited by Moise Tshombe (and who rescued the Congo from an attempted armed Communist take-over) may complicate the basic trouble, but it is certainly not its cause. Continuously to talk about foreign mercenary invasions staged by Belgium, France, or West Germany is therefore

utter nonsense, and nobody knows it better than General Mobutu in Kinshasa.

Washington's Folly

But a scapegoat is, of course, necessary. Ever since independence seven years ago, much of the Congo's time has been spent in search of scapegoats for the ills which misrule has brought upon that unhappy country. It can be only because of some serious oversight that South Africa and Rhodesia were this time not included in the list of culprits. Portugal has, however, not escaped, and even Spain has been dragged in.

In the circumstances, it is unfortunate that Washington should have seen fit to lend support to the lie by sending aircraft to help the Congolese Army. (This criticism does not apply to the provision of air transport for the purely humanitarian act of evacuating hostages.)

The Security Council resolution, asking all outsiders to refrain from supporting the dissident forces, is, to sophisticated Europeans, harmless enough. But it overlooks the fact that to millions of unsophisticated Africans, both inside and outside the Congo, it reads like a confirmation of Mobutu's allegations.

Tshombe's Proposals

The fate of Tshombe himself after his kidnapping in mid-air remains uncertain at the time of writing, and appears to be bleak. But it is relevant to recall at this moment that the only realistic proposals for the future of the Congo came from him seven years ago on the eve of independence.¹

At that time he told our Special Correspondent on African Affairs, as he told everybody else who cared to listen, including the Belgians, Patrice Lumumba, and the United Nations,

¹At the time of going to press, Tshombe's fate is still undecided. If he is sent back to the Congo for execution, this will be an international disgrace.

that the Congo can hope to survive in peace, and at least as a loose entity, *only* if it is realised that it in fact comprises six different and separate nations.

Tshombe's proposal therefore was a confederation of six semi-autonomous states with only certain limited powers reserved for a central government. Each of the six was to consist of a logical ethnic and economic grouping which reality dictated. And because some were poor and some were rich, with Katanga the richest of them all, he acknowledged the obligation of Katanga to use a considerable part of her wealth to enable the central government to even out the economic differentiation and to help with the development of the poorer regions.

Bitter Lessons

It was only after the total rejection of his proposals and the imposition of a unitary form of government that he tried to lead Katanga on its own path.

Yet the seven years that have passed have proved to anyone willing to learn the bitter lessons of the Congo that Tshombe's original proposal remains the only hope for the Congo. Without some such arrangement the misery, chaos, and bloodshed will continue, with or without foreign mercenaries and with or without American aircraft.

It is a measure of the nightmare of the Congo and the incubus which seems to have those in power in Kinshasa in its grip that there is an idea that all that need be done to save the Congo is to hang Tshombe publicly.

Nigeria's Nightmare

The same nightmare has not yet descended upon Nigeria, although the massacre of countless thousands in the past eighteen months is warning enough of what lies ahead unless reality re-asserts itself.

It must be remembered that the Congo and Nigeria are the two most important countries in black Africa—the Congo because of its size (nearly one million square miles) and its geographical location right in the heart of Africa, and Nigeria because it has

overwhelmingly the largest population in Africa, approaching 60 million.

If these two key countries go down the drain, there is not a country in black Africa which will not be severely affected by the aftermath. If, therefore, there appears to be little hope for the immediate future of the Congo, is there at least still some hope for Nigeria?

An Explosive Mixture

Once more, as in the case of the Congo, Nigeria is essentially three different countries experimentally joined together by Britain in a federation a relatively short time before independence. It has turned out to be an explosive mixture.

Just how explosive it was the Ibos discovered in the past eighteen months when thousands of them were massacred by other ethnic groups. Their home is what used to be the Eastern Region, and something between 1.5 million and 2 million of them who were living in other parts of the country streamed back to the region of their homeland which recently declared itself independent as the Republic of Biafra, with a total population of about 14 million.

The central Government in Lagos has now set about the task of crushing Biafra by military force. The federal forces—what remains of them—are now themselves a tribal hotchpotch of Yorubas and Hausa-Fulanis; at best an uneasy alliance which may at any time break down.

Unrest Will Remain

But defeating the Biafra forces will solve nothing. The tribal unrest, which is the cause of the trouble, will remain. The only thing that will change is that the revenue from Biafra's oil deposits will once more become available to the central Government in Lagos. (Like Katanga in the Congo, Biafra is the richest region of Nigeria.)

There may therefore be a fairer sharing out of the wealth; but access to the oil wealth will help the Lagos Government no more in settling the political troubles than access to Katanga's copper riches has helped the

Kinshasa Government to solve the Congo's political problems.

Under the original independence constitution which remained in force until the revolt early last year in which Sir Abubakar Balewa was murdered, the different regions of Nigeria enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy, but the minority Ibos and Yorubas nevertheless felt dominated by a central Government which was weighted against them through the numerical superiority of the Hausa-Fulanis of the north. That was the start of the trouble.

Sir Abubakar's successor, General Ironsi, who was in turn murdered in the second uprising, tried to do away with the federal system, which would have meant that the Hausa-Fulanis would have lost much of their independence and would have been more strictly under the control of the coastal Ibos and Yorubas. The result was a second disaster, and more bloodshed.

The Answer?

What the Ibos have since then been holding out for is a kind of confederal association with the rest of Nigeria on almost the same basis as Tshombe originally advocated for Katanga in

relation to the rest of the Congo. When Lagos stood firm, the Ibos seceded and set up the state of Biafra, much as Tshombe once seceded.

The lesson of Nigeria's immediate past therefore seems to be that the idea of a unitary form of government is a non-starter, certain to end in widespread bloodshed, and that even the federal form of government bequeathed by Britain was a too close association between the antagonistic regions.

Is the answer therefore not perhaps the identical form of loose confederation which Tshombe once proposed for the Congo?

The trouble, of course, is that a solution of this kind needs cool tempers and a great deal of realism. But these are the very two factors most lacking when tribal animosities take control. In addition, there are, once more, too many outside interests at work. While the tragedy unfolds it must therefore remain an academic question.

But unless it is answered honestly, the tragedy will continue, and Africa will continue to go down the drain—particularly as this is the same problem which potentially faces every black country in Africa.

INDIA: REHEARSAL FOR A VIETNAM?

OUR NEW DELHI Correspondent reports:

Naxalbari is the area in West Bengal that has been chosen by the Peking-line Left Communists¹ to stage rehearsals of a Vietnam-type situation in India. This jungle area is inhabited by economically backward hill tribes.

Since the general elections, the West Bengal State Government has been made up of a united front of various leftist parties in which the Left Communists predominate. Committed to strategy and tactics in accord with the "Thoughts of Mao Tse-tung", Naxalbari was chosen for the "Vietnam" rehearsal.

Although the State Government is headed by a non-Communist Chief

Minister, it has become obvious that the tune is really called by Jyoti Basu, Deputy Chief Minister and a leader of the Left Communist Party, with other leftists in the united front either nodding reluctant approval or not daring to oppose the dominant Left Communists.

A favourable pre-condition was created, under Communist initiative, for the staging of the Mao-Thought experiment in Naxalbari. This was the formulation of a so-called progressive policy regarding the use of police forces in relation to "popular" movements. Whether in labour disputes or peasant movements, the police were forbidden to do anything without permission from the Minister concerned.

Whipped-up Intimidation

After formulating this "progressive

¹The Left Communists are pro-Peking; the Right Communists pro-Moscow.

policy on the use of police force" in the urban areas, the Left Communists whipped up intimidatory trade union action against employers and managements. A movement called the *Gherao* mushroomed all over the industrial areas of West Bengal.

The *Gherao* movement consists of the surrounding of employers and management personnel by a large number of workers in a factory or mill premises and preventing them from going out for hours together—or in some cases days—until all the demands of the besieging mass of workers are conceded.

In the rural areas peasants have been similarly whipped up by Left Communist activists to occupy the lands of landowners, loot all the stored grains, and organise themselves into armed groups.

An Unchecked Rampage

The tribesmen in the Naxalbari area were easily persuaded to liquidate numerous landlords. Armed with bows and arrows, they were deployed to go on a rampage unchecked by any police interference. For two months, all the landowners were in a state of terror. Many were hacked to death along with their families, all their stored grains were looted, and hopes soared amongst the Left Communists that Naxalbari could be made the staging area for a miniature "Vietnam", with a "liberation army" gradually to fan out all over the rural areas.

Peking Radio continually broadcast that Naxalbari was a successful experiment of a rural-based mass revolution overwhelming the urban areas in accord with the strategy outlined in "Mao's Thoughts", which had become the standard handbook for revolution.

Alarm and Protest

Naxalbari has become the major news item all over India.¹ The impact

¹This is hardly surprising. What is surprising is that this sinister and significant development seems to have had virtually no publicity in the western Press.

of developments there was becoming so pronounced amongst all the non-Communist parties that considerable alarm was generated at the way in which the Left Communists were getting away with their plans and programmes.

The non-Communist leftist members of the West Bengal Government, such as the Left Socialists and Democratic Socialists, began to protest. Meanwhile, the non-Communist Chief Minister was invited to Delhi for urgent consultations with the Central Government.

At last the Chief Minister himself became convinced that this was no peasant protest which was occurring in Naxalbari, but a carefully planned rehearsal for a Vietnam-type insurrection under the auspices of his Left Communist colleagues.

Significance At Last Realised

In the meantime, in order to make pretence of constitutional respectability, the Left Communist Party "expelled" the "adventurist" party leaders in the Naxalbari area.

The Right Communists, who are also represented in the West Bengal Government, squirmed and publicly mouthed phrases supporting the "peasant movement", but privately told even their "*bourgeois*" enemies that what was happening in Naxalbari was something terrible and that something should immediately and decisively be done to fight it.

At last, the Chief Minister of West Bengal was persuaded to realise the significance of developments. In this, he was helped more by Peking Radio broadcasts than by the briefing given by the Central Government in Delhi.

Finally, he ordered the police to intervene effectively and, for the time being, the "revolution" has been contained.

Nervousness of the Central Government

Meanwhile, the onslaught of the Left Communists against all other parties goes on apace. A trade union leader belonging to the Left Socialist group has been spared to death,

reportedly by a mob of Left Communist workers. Another trade union leader, belonging to the Congress Party, was assaulted and killed.

The Central Government has decided not to intervene. It is nervous, because it believes that the earlier experience of dismissing a Communist Government in Kerala and imposing President's rule resulted in an increase of

Communist strength. It wishes to avoid that possibility in West Bengal.

The Central Government hopes that the intimidatory activities of the Left Communists will bring about a serious rift in the united front. This, the Central Government believes, would be the most desirable solution.

The next few months should show how far these experiences will prove true.

MEXICO: LATIN AMERICA'S SHOWPLACE

OUR SPECIAL Correspondent on Latin American Affairs writes:

In contrast with the extremely serious situation in Bolivia and the potentially explosive one in Haiti,¹ Mexico is still being pointed to as the showplace of Latin America—just as, not too long ago, Nigeria was called the showplace of Africa.

On the surface, there is good reason to consider that all is well in Mexico. The country has enjoyed political stability for almost forty years, during which time Presidential and other elections have been regularly held. Six successive Presidents have now attained office by constitutional means. Five of them served their full six-year term and yielded place peacefully and willingly to their successors. The sixth now appears firmly in power and intends to turn over the reins of government at the end of his mandate.

Although minor political parties exist and are even being encouraged by the Government itself, the essentially one-party system controlled by the PRI (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional*) continues to win all the elections, including the Congressional ones in July of this year.

The Army is no longer a factor in politics. There has not been a successful armed uprising since 1920, nor a *major* armed conflict of any kind since 1930.

Economic and Social Progress

Economically and socially, too, there has been progress. In 1960, the

population was 34,923,125; for 1969, it is estimated at 46,774,200—an annual average growth rate of 3.3 per cent. compared with 2.76 per cent. in the decade from 1940 to 1950.

The gross national product, which in 1960 stood at only £12.330 million, had risen to \$18.098 million in 1965, and is forecast at \$22.847 million for 1969, or an annual growth rate of 7.1 per cent. from 1960 to 1969.

Medical services of the social welfare institutes are now excellent and, in contrast with a few years back, employees now prefer them to private doctors.

The Government supplies free textbooks in the primary and secondary schools.

Undoubtedly, there is much to be pointed to as a showplace.

1966 a Good Year

1966 was another good year for the Mexican economy. Most of the productive sectors reached rates of growth greater than in 1965. At the end of 1966, monetary reserves in the balance of payments stood at an all-time high of \$581.2 million, and the exchange rate, in contrast to the widely gyrating currencies of most Latin American countries, has remained stable at 12½ pesos to the U.S. dollar since April, 1954.

Dependent largely on the tourist trade for income, which derives mainly from the United States, relations with that country are described as excellent, for, as an educated Mexican told your observer: "They could not be otherwise, since God is far and the U.S.A. near".

¹See *The Weekly Review* of July 21 and July 28, 1967.

Mexico City

Whoever visits Mexico City today is immediately impressed with its modernity and grandeur. Wide boulevards with fast-moving traffic of large late-model cars, well-dressed people, modern buildings and shops, amongst which book and art stores abound, tree-lined avenues with illuminated statues and parks, tall and modern hotels, and the recently-built marble U.S. Embassy, contrast favourably with many other Latin American cities.

Eating in a first-class restaurant in Chapultepec Park with its floor-to-ceiling windows opening on illuminated fountains shooting high in the night air, one is easily led to believe that Mexico is indeed progressing and progressive.

On Thawing Ice

But on closer analysis by the sociologist and the political scientist, the situation in Mexico can be compared to strong ice over a great lake at the end of winter. The ice still bears like a rock, but, unseen and unheard, the water beneath it is warming with the approaching spring. It is thawing from below, but to the eye, to the foot, for all apparent purposes, it is as solid as ever.

For beneath this solid top stratum of society in the capital, in the hovels of the poor on the outskirts of the big cities, in the small towns and in the squatters' huts out in the hinterland of cactus-clad desert and barren mountain, social pressures are building up which are a portent of things to come.

Here, despite all the statistics, one can still see what Henry George in his *Progress and Poverty* called "the open-mouthed and relentless hell which yawns beneath civilised society". Here, as elsewhere in Latin America and throughout the Afro-Asian world, is the rising threat of the "House of Want upon the House of Have".

Vital Sectors Neglected

For while the over-all gross national product has been rising, declines have actually occurred in agriculture, cattle-raising, and fishing. These vital sectors have been neglected by both the

Government and private capital, and, with the growing population, threaten mass hunger.

Agriculturally speaking, Mexico is essentially a poor country. About 70 per cent. of it is mountainous: the northern half is practically desert with inadequate rain; and in the south the rains come at the wrong time.

Thus, whereas the country's total land area is nearly two million square kilometres, only about 600,000 sq. km. are available for agriculture and cattle-raising. And of these 600,000, only about 12 per cent. have water which results from man-made hydraulic works.

Movement to the Cities

The Government proudly proclaims that Mexico had its revolution nearly 60 years ago, and that with it came land reform. But the hard facts of life are that, despite the land distribution programme which started in 1915, the number of landless peasants today exceeds the number of those who hold land. Worse still, the Government now has very little land with which to make further distributions amongst millions of the desperate landless.

This has, in turn, engendered a movement to the cities, where problems have increased because of the shortages of housing, water, jobs, hygiene, and education. There were scattered riots at several universities during April and May—Communist-inspired, of course; but such riots were based upon the very real psychological fear of many students that upon graduation they will not be able to find jobs for which they are studying, since the country needs to create at least half-a-million new jobs annually due to population growth.

Misleading Figures

Many knowledgeable Mexicans themselves, both in and out of the Government, openly state that the gross national product figures are misleading since they reflect progress only of the upper class and a part of the middle class, but not of the proletariat and peasants.

Despite the revolution, wealth is

concentrated among a relatively few. About seven million workers are said to earn only the minimum wage of \$1 a day for farm labour and \$3 a day in some cities. Other millions are not paid even the legal minimum and many farm families' average income is estimated at less than \$100 a year.

Mexico is the only country in the western hemisphere which still maintains relations with Castro's Cuba. The Cuban Embassy is therefore a centre for all manner of Communist propaganda, infiltration, and subversion. The leftist magazines *Siempre* and *Successos* are sold at most news-stands, and the works of Lenin and Marx in Spanish are available at most bookstores at prices below those of regular Mexican books.

Two Communist schools for the training of guerrillas were recently discovered in the capital, and a Cuban diplomat was sent home for his involvement in smuggling arms.

Dark Days Ahead

Small wonder that this year the Mexican Army had to take control of the State of Sonora, after three days of violence, and to quell rioting by farmers in a number of states, as well as to expel landless squatters from land they attempted to occupy.

In addition, the police in an action in the State of Guerrero had a battle in which eleven were killed and more than a hundred wounded. And in Yucatan an enraged mob succeeded in preventing a meeting in favour of the PRI's candidate for Federal Deputy.

President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, who prided himself that he was the only Head of State at the Punta del Este conference without a bodyguard and who could walk unescorted down the Montevideo streets, now faces dark days ahead. The thaw is beginning beneath the ice in Latin America's showplace. It could soon become a flood.

WORLD ROUND-UP

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE in any one issue of *Intelligence Digest* to publish full reports or considered comment on every aspect of world affairs. Only a few of the currently most important aspects of the world situation can be so reported in any one issue; and the subjects chosen for full reporting naturally vary with the fluctuations of the situation.

Nevertheless, the Editor realises that the fact that, say, the Middle East is in a state of crisis or certain aspects of the American domestic scene are pressing serious in a world context does not mean that there are not other important trends and developments elsewhere.

We propose therefore in future to publish every month a short summary of relevant trends and factors on which it has not been possible to make full reports.

* * *

***The Far East:** Some decisive outcome from the Vietnam war is still anxiously awaited. This arises not so much from very deep feelings for the South Vietnamese as from a profound anxiety to see whether, in fact, the U.S.

can contain the Communist forces of Asia—let alone defeat them.

If America fails in Vietnam, many states of the Far East will feel it necessary to seek some kind of accommodation with Peking. The future trend of Japanese policy cannot be excluded from these considerations; nor can Taiwan, Thailand, South Korea, and Indonesia—a grouping which, convinced of its security, could set a pattern of regional development and cooperation which others would want to follow.

* * *

***Australasia:** There is a growing feeling that the future depends on relationships with the U.S. This applies not only to strategic security, but also to the economic future. There is no lack of friendship for Britain, but facts are being faced.

What is perhaps not fully appreciated is that the phase of "leave it to America" is coming to an end. America is not altogether satisfied that Australia and New Zealand fully understand that they must assume their full

share of the burdens and responsibilities involved in security.

* * *

***Southern Africa:** There is a fixed determination to make the southern third of the African continent a safe area for law and order and for the social and economic progress of *all* its people. Rhodesia has become a key factor in this. The British Government would be wise to come to terms with this situation.

This southern African concept under the leadership of South Africa has the sympathy of a majority of those black Africans who realise what it means. We are, unfortunately, not told about this in either the British or the American Press.

* * *

***Central Africa:** Chaos, bloodshed, and tribal warfare on an increasing scale.

* * *

***North Africa:** Very divided. Tunisia and Morocco are not at all happy about Nasser's aggressive policies or about the growing manifestations of Russian power in the east Mediterranean.

* * *

***Latin America:** Great dangers in Bolivia and Haiti. Colombia and Uruguay politically shaky.

The basic trouble is economic. A

reappraisal of the Alliance for Progress is needed. What has gone wrong with it?

* * *

***Western Europe:** The big question is British entry into the Common Market and its *political* conditions.

West German foreign policy should be very closely watched. Germany does not quite know where she is going. She feels that she needs a partner. Basically resentful of de Gaulle's assumption of European leadership, anxious and apprehensive about America's approaches towards Russia and fearful that western Europe may be abandoned to Soviet influence, West Germany is asking herself who shall be her partner for the next 25 years?

Something new is stirring in German politics arising from these doubts. It will not be neo-Nazism. Germany has been cured of Nazism, for the simple reason that it did not pay.

This situation must be watched with the utmost care.

* * *

***Turkey and Greece:** Since the Greek *coup* by the military junta, Turkey and Greece are nearer understanding than they have ever been. Some interesting developments may arise from this.

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

A Binder and Index. At the end of the year, many subscribers may like to put their year's copies of *Intelligence Digest* into a binder. Attractive binders are available. They will include an index for the previous twelve months for easy reference to back numbers.

The cost of index and binder will be £1 or U.S. \$3, including postage.

Back Numbers. A few complete sets of *Intelligence Digest* for 1966 are available. These, together with binder and index, can be had at £5 14s. or \$16. This may be of special interest to libraries.

INTELLIGENCE DIGEST

GIFT SERVICE

THE FACTS reported in this issue of *Intelligence Digest* are grave. But they are facts and they show that the forces in the world struggle are grouping themselves for a decisive show-down. Yet we have constantly been told that there is a relaxation of international tensions. The facts are little understood by masses of people. Because of this, our Governments are all the time hampered in their efforts to frame and apply the correct policies to meet the growing dangers to the Free World.

This is because public opinion and those in key opinion-making positions are not informed as to the facts.

It is essential to arouse public opinion to the facts. To do this, those facts must first be given to those who are in a position to form and guide public opinion—clergy, teachers, and so on.

You can help in this by making it possible for us to send *Intelligence Digest* to key opinion-makers. Under our gift plan we supply *Intelligence Digest* to such people (at no cost to the recipients) at only one-quarter of the full subscription rate. We can do this because it is possible to produce *extra* copies over and above our basic circulation relatively cheaply.

During 1962 and 1963, subscribers to this Service provided a fund which made it possible for 283,370 copies of *Intelligence Digest* to be sent to key opinion-makers in different places who would not otherwise have seen or read the facts which we have been able to publish. The latest events and developments in world affairs show how vital it is to continue and extend this gift service. Unless those of us who realise the dangers do this, resistance to Communist infiltration and aggression will collapse.

You can choose the names; or you can leave it to us to choose them. If you give \$100 or £31.5s., 25 people will get *Intelligence Digest* for one year; if you give \$20 or £6.5s., five people will get it.

We believe that our gift plan has aroused many key people; but a far bigger effort is now needed.

— — — — —
The Publishers, *Intelligence Digest*,
41 Rodney Road, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, England.

I.D. S/1.

I donate.....for sending *Intelligence Digest* free for one year to:

***The persons whose names and addresses are attached.**

***Persons to be selected by you.**

(*Please delete as applicable.)

Name (Block letters please)

Address

Signed..... Date.....

(Cheques should be made payable to *Intelligence Digest*.)

INTELLIGENCE DIGEST

Intelligence Digest and The Weekly Review are produced from:

41 Rodney Road, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, England.

(Tel.: Cheltenham 57774. Telegrams: Digest Cheltenham.)

U.S.A.: Miss Constance J. Brandon, 1330 Broadway, Room 811,
Oakland, California 94612, U.S.A.

(The U.S. address is for enquiries and NOT for renewal payments to—*The Weekly Review and Intelligence Digest.*)

Japanese Edition: Mr. J. Kusano,
The Jackson Trading Co. Inc., Nakagin-Bldg, 9th Floor, No. 5,
8-Chome, Chuo-ku, Tokyo.

Editor of the *Intelligence Digest* Service: John de Courcy.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

<i>Sterling</i>	<i>Dollar</i>	
£5 5s. 0d. for one year.	\$17.00 for one year.	} Including 2nd class airmail charges.
£9 10s. 0d. for two years.	\$32.00 for two years.	
£30 0s. 0d. for life.	\$44.00 for three years.	
	\$160.00 for life.	

(Overseas subscriptions may be paid by ordinary cheque from all countries where exchange control regulations so permit.)

Extra airmail charges (2nd class) for overseas subscribers: 7s. per annum.

Braille edition: 12s. per year (subsidised by funds for the blind).
The Braille issue can be obtained from The Manager, The Scottish Braille Press,
Craigmillar Park, Edinburgh, 9. A remittance of 12s. should accompany applications.

©(1967) Ringrone Newspapers (1966)Ltd., and Intelligence Digest, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, England.
